

## Raised Bill 6355 An Act Concerning Risk Protection Orders or Warrants

To the Honorable Members of the Judiciary Committee:

I would like to add my voice in opposition to Bill 6355.

As I'm sure you know, CT already has a Risk Warrant law (Sec 29-38c), and while not perfect, it has served it's purpose well. This new proposal, which proponents say will "update" and "modernize" this statute, does nothing of the sort. It really is a major step backwards, being pushed by a political agenda, based on shoddy statistics, and so-called "facts" mostly disseminated by the Giffords/Bloomberg groups.\*

In eliminating the law enforcement's role in investigating whether an individual's firearms should be seized, the police are taken out of the initial equation; a judge will only hear one side of the case.

There are multiple concerns here. Many groups of people are empowered to file a complaint, which isn't in itself a problem, however there is no law enforcement investigation, prior to the confiscation. There are no penalties for a false filing.

And because there is no initial investigation, the police are sent blindly into a potentially dangerous situation. They have no previous experience with the subject, which can, and likely will, lead to more SWAT-like interactions with the subject of the warrant.

With the Brianna Taylor incident, and others like it, we've already seen the tragic results of overly aggressive police tactics involving innocent people. Currently, roughly 1/3 of these risk warrants are not granted permanent status. With this proposed bill, that number will only increase. Too many innocent people will be wrongly subject to aggressive police raids; people, who by the way, have not been charged with any criminal activity. This is a serious injustice.

A good bill seeks to balance individual freedoms, with public safety. This proposal fails that test by a wide margin.

Please relegate Bill 6355 to the dustbin where it rightfully belongs.

Jeffrey Moores  
Farmington CT

\*For a more thorough discussion of the subject please refer to this link:  
<https://www.judiciary.senate.gov/download/03/25/2019/kopel-testimony>

It makes for interesting reading.